

### Comments and Suggestions

#### Part B, Research Planning.

##### Pp. 1-3. Academic and intelligence research.

The parallel is overdrawn and overgeneralized. Academic fields vary as to degree of pragmatism, change, pressure, and other characteristics.

##### Pp. 9-18. Criteria for determining significance of research topics.

Treatment in terms of charters is too formal and too remote from needs of average analyst. Charters should perhaps be used for supplementary reading or else pertinent parts could be extracted.

No attention is given to EIC subcommittees which initiate statements of gaps and priority research topics.

##### Pp. 19-30. Terms of reference.

Why not begin with the problem and derive the title and terms of reference from the problem? This would more realistically cover self-initiated projects. A special case could then be made to show how to proceed when the title and perhaps the terms of reference are received from outside, as in NIE or NIS type projects.

##### Pp. 28-30. Other items.

Much of this is not miscellaneous but is of great pertinence and should be reorganized to illustrate what terms of reference are like and how they are used to delineate and define research problems.

##### P. 29. Man-hour estimates.

Misleading.